

THE WAR OF THE EXPERTS

THE spectacle of eminent scientists who are in radical—not to say bitter—disagreement over the amount of danger to human health and life from nuclear bomb tests is one of the less attractive wonders of our age. Scientists, the general public has been led to believe, are men who have the habit of careful and precise statement. Yet in the matter of radiation fall-out, the range of scientific opinion, including the opinions of Nobel prize-winners, stretches from the view that the risk to health of fall-out is so slight as to be negligible, to the firm assertion that even the tests thus far have already doomed many persons to lasting ills.

According to *U.S. News & World Report* for June 7, a total of 117 atomic explosions have been set off since the first nuclear device was detonated in the United States on July 16, 1945. Of this total, the United States is responsible for sixty-seven, averaging about six explosions a year. Russia is reported to have set off some forty explosions (five a year), and Britain, ten, or two a year. The point of the *U.S. News* story is the claim, based upon the 1956 Academy of Sciences report and other statements by scientists, that atomic radiation from fall-out is a tiny fraction of the radiation produced by "natural background" and by medical and dental X-rays. Viscount Cherwell, a member of the British Atomic Energy Authority, is quoted as saying that recent critics of the tests, such as Pope Pius XII and Dr. Albert Schweitzer, have allowed themselves "to be taken in by the inaccurate propaganda of the friends of Russia." Lord Cherwell maintained that "the true facts have been set out, both here and in America, by scientists of high repute with access to all the secret data." The British expert expressed "surprise" that men in "high positions" but "without scientific knowledge" should brush aside the "true facts" and make appeals to the public on "scientific questions which they are really not

competent to judge." *U.S. News* makes much of the claim that while tests carried on by Britain and the United States have been vigorously opposed, test shots by the Russians pass almost without comment. No mention is made of the possibility that the objectors to nuclear experiments may regard the tests pursued by their own countries as more their own responsibility, and within an area where popular protests may have some hope of exerting an influence.

In contrast to the "expert" opinion marshalled by *U.S. News & World Report* is the massive opposition to the tests among scientists. More than two thousand American scientists have joined with Linus Pauling, world famous chemist and Nobel Laureate, of the California Institute of Technology, in an appeal for international agreement to stop the bomb tests. This appeal, a petition for which all the signatures were obtained within a week of its release to the public, was to be forwarded by Dr. Pauling to Rep. Chet Holifield, of Los Angeles, who is chairman of a Congressional subcommittee investigating radiation fall-out hazards.

Dr. Pauling prepared the appeal, acting as an individual scientist, and it was signed by himself and other eminent workers in research as individuals. No organization is represented by the appeal nor by the signatures. Other Nobel Laureates who signed are Dr. H. J. Muller, leading geneticist, of Indiana University, and Dr. Joseph Erlanger, of Washington University. Many other well-known geneticists signed the appeal, and about forty members of the National Academy of Sciences. The text of the appeal is as follows:

We, the American scientists whose names are signed below, urge that an international agreement to stop the testing of nuclear bombs be made now.

Each nuclear bomb test spreads an added burden of radioactive elements over every part of the world.

Each added amount of radiation causes damage to the health of human beings all over the world and causes damage to the pool of human germ plasm such as to lead to an increase in the number of seriously defective children that will be born in future generations.

So long as these weapons are in the hands of only three powers an agreement for their control is feasible. If testing continues, and the possession of these weapons spreads to additional governments, the danger of outbreak of a cataclysmic nuclear war through the reckless action of some irresponsible national leader will be greatly increased.

An international agreement to stop the testing of nuclear bombs now could serve as a first step toward a more general disarmament and the ultimate effective abolition of nuclear weapons, averting the possibility of a nuclear war that would be catastrophic to all humanity.

We have in common with our fellow men a deep concern for the welfare of all human beings. As scientists we have knowledge of the dangers involved and therefore a special responsibility to make those dangers known. We deem it imperative that immediate action be taken to effect international agreement to stop the testing of all nuclear weapons.

Dr. Muller's signature on the petition is of special significance, since he received the Nobel Prize in 1946 for his discovery that penetrating radiation produces mutations in plants and animals. Prof. L. H. Snyder, of the University of Oklahoma, is another eminent geneticist who signed the appeal. Prof. Snyder is now president of the American Association of the Advancement of Science.

The release prepared for the press by this group of scientists has the following explanatory note:

About half the scientists who signed the appeal are biologists, and many of the others are biochemists, chemists, or medical students. The number of physicists who signed the appeal is small. Some physicists who refrained from signing stated that they did not have sufficient knowledge of the biological effects of penetrating radiation to sign a statement in which they say that they have knowledge of the dangers involved in bomb tests, and many of these non-signers said that they supported the appeal

and would have signed if it had not contained this sentence.

Dr. Pauling's own views on the effects of nuclear testing are considerably stronger than the appeal. In the Los Angeles *Times* article (June 4) which printed the appeal, Dr. Pauling is quoted as saying that "the fall-out from nuclear tests which have already been carried out will cause 200,000 children in each of the next twenty generations to be mentally or physically defective." On June 5, the day after news of the Pauling appeal appeared, the *Times* reported an interview with Mrs. Raymond Wilson, who has just returned from a ten-month stay in Japan. Mrs. Wilson told a *Times* women's-page reporter that the Japanese women asked her again and again:

"Why can't American women understand how we feel, how terrible it is to live as we do, and do something about it?"

Mrs. Wilson explained:

Japanese women live in fear—fear of the rain, fear of the milk they must give their children and fear of the fish which is so essential to their diet. All of these fears are the result of atomic and H-bomb tests being conducted by the British, the Russians and the Americans.

The importance of Mrs. Wilson's statement lies in the factual sources on which it is based. She said:

Unfortunately, the fear of the Japanese people is not without reason. My husband, who is executive secretary of the Friends Committee on Legislation, made a study of the results of the bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki and found that now, 12 years later, people are still dying from their after-effects.

The United States Atomic Energy Commission reported that while official estimates placed the dead at 125,000, the tally probably exceeded 200,000. Most of the surviving population of both bombed cities received both serious and minor injuries and are still dying from them.

More important are the claims of scientists of the Atomic Bomb Casualty Commission that while there have been no significant genetic effects observed thus far within the first generation of

Hiroshima and Nagasaki, it may take 50 years before conclusive findings can be made.

They do know that 15 children, mostly in the first four months of pregnancy, did suffer some developmental effect, mostly microcephalism (heads smaller than normal) with, usually, some mental retardation.

This is another fear with which the women of Japan are forced to live. They know too that leukemia and cancer are more prevalent among bomb victims and they are afraid that the radioactive fall-out from bombs tested now will claim more child victims of these dread diseases.

Fear of the contamination of rain is great in Japan. No one dares to go in the rain without an umbrella, and the fear is aggravated by the fact that rainwater is widely used for drinking in Japan. Further:

Milk is another problem. Cows eating grass contaminated by radioactive fall-out give radioactive milk and this milk presents a definite hazard to children. But the major problem is fish. The Japanese people depend upon fish for the protein essential to their diet. Meat is scarce. The per capita consumption of beef in Japan is 2½ pounds per person per year. Chicken is almost as scarce.

This year, as the result of the bomb set off by the British on Christmas Island, thousands of miles of ocean have been placed off limits for the Japanese fishermen. The ban was put on in April and will not be lifted until August. This has caused a serious shortage in the supply of fish.

In West Germany, as is now well known, eighteen physicists have told Chancellor Adenauer that they would not have anything more to do with bombs. In England, the British Atomic Scientists Association announced that H-bomb explosions might produce 1,000 cases of bone cancer for every million tons of explosive power, and when Selwyn Lloyd charged that much of the agitation against the tests came from "Communist sources," a British labor paper called his claim a "new low" in "propaganda by a minister."

How are we to understand the great differences of opinion among scientists on a question of such extraordinary importance? There

are of course the political considerations, such as those voiced by three California scientists who, admitting that the tests involve "risks," hold that the danger must be balanced against the "threats to freedom by discontinuing the tests." Among those minimizing the danger is a former research director of the AEC, who said: "Risks to human life from nuclear bomb tests are very small—much smaller than the risks we take in our everyday living." But after these factors have been weighed, there remains one other—a factor discussed at some length by J. Bronowski in a lecture printed in the *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* and later put into a pamphlet by the Society for Social Responsibility in Science. Dr. Bronowski said:

We must not forget that scientists do bear a heavy responsibility. I am of course about to explain that really the public and governments bear the main responsibility. But this does not shift from us, the scientists, the grave onus of having acquiesced in the abuse of science. We have contrived weapons and policies with our public conscience, which each of us individually would never have undertaken with his private conscience. Men are only murderers in large groups. They do not individually go out and strangle their neighbor. And scientists are murderers only in large groups—collectively. For scientists are very ordinary human beings. Any collection of people in any laboratory contains good and bad, people with consciences and without, and what we have allowed to happen is the conquest of science by the minority without conscience which exists in every group.

It is sad that scientists have been exceptionally corruptible. Look into your own experience. Most of us have come from poor parents. We have worked our own way up. The practice of science has enabled us to earn salaries which would be unthinkable to us if we had stayed peddling whatever our fathers peddled. Quite suddenly, the possession of a special skill has opened to us a blue door into the antechambers of prime ministers. We sit at conference tables, we have become important people, because we happen to be able to be murderers. And therefore scientists have been bought with large salaries and fellowships and rewards quite inappropriate to their merits, because a policy was furthered by their techniques. The scientist has proved to be the easiest of all men to blind with the attractions of public life.

Dr. Bronowski's position is that while public decisions must be made by the public, the individual scientist has his own, individual responsibility in all matters involving his special skill—a responsibility, we may note, which Dr. Pauling and the two thousand scientists who signed his petition are now exercising. Dr. Bronowski writes:

My claim is that the individual scientist should exercise his own personal conscience. This is his duty. What is the duty of governments in this respect? It is to make it possible for him to exercise his conscience. The responsibility of governments in this is to create the conditions in which a scientist can say: No! to projects in which he does not want to take part. He must even be able to give advice which is distasteful to those in authority, and still must not be hounded out of public life or prevented from making a living.

In all countries, the serious threat to scientists who have once touched the fringes of secret subjects is that they are then caught in something from which they can never escape again. They do not get a passport, in case somebody captures them. They cannot get a job because, if they do not want to do this then they are too dangerous or awkward to be trusted with anything else. This is what we must prevent governments from doing, and this can only be prevented by the opinion of quite ordinary citizens. This is the duty which citizens owe to scientists, to insist that governments shall make it possible for scientists to be conscientious objectors if they wish.

With the great weight of scientific opinion lying *against* continued testing of nuclear bombs, Dr. Bronowski's evaluation of the role of the scientist under economic and political attractions—or pressures—assumes added importance. But the role of the individual citizen remains most important of all, for without the support of the conscientious citizen, the conscientious scientist has only a private voice.

Letter from **AFRICA**

[The formation of the Capricorn Africa Society was reported in MANAS for Sept. 19, 1956. This society is devoted to the promotion of thinking about multi-racial government for African countries, and to this end has provided a document called the "Capricorn Contract," which offers "a new political faith acceptable and emotionally valid for all races." The Capricorn Contract is also intended to serve as a model for actual political constitutions in the newly developing African countries. (Copies of the Capricorn Contract may be obtained from the Society's headquarters, 43 Cheval Place, London, S.W. 7, England.)

A letter critical of the Capricorn program, written by N. Kirilo Japhet, a Tanganyikan African farmer, was printed in MANAS for Dec. 12, 1956. Mr. Japhet's letter brought the present rejoinder, contributed by two African members of the Capricorn Society. We now close discussion of this subject, since it seems plain that readers with a serious interest in the emerging political alternatives of the African communities of the future have need of much more exhaustive information than the pages of MANAS can supply.—Editors.]

Editors, MANAS: We have been sent a copy of your paper, MANAS, of Dec. 12, by our friend, Laurens van der Post [author of *The Dark Eye in Africa*], and we feel that it is up to us Tanganyika Africans to reply to this clever but misleading and inaccurate picture.

Firstly, the writer pinpoints three names of people attending the Capricorn Convention from outside East Africa, and tries to create an untrue impression that a few humanitarians from outside are the main supporters of the Capricorn Africa Society, ignoring the fifty delegates from East Africa who represented the far greater number of East African members at the Convention.

It seems odd that a committed Christian should be proud of the part he has played in organising TANU (Tanganyika African National Union), whose appeal is based on Black Nationalism in a country which must find a multiracial answer; because of this, TANU will

obviously clash with the liberal philosophy of Capricorn. With the same cynical deception, he pretends that TANU subscribes to the UN Declaration of Human Rights, although membership in TANU is restricted deliberately to the black African. TANU has steadfastly refused to open its ranks to well-wishers of other races.

Mr. Japhet, commenting on the Capricorn voting system [of multiple vote], ignores the universally accepted principle that the wholly desirable state of universal adult franchise cannot be achieved in one step without creating chaos, without some degree of selective staging. Of this staging, Capricorn has produced some of the most sensible thoughts in Africa, the problem being tackled by its multiracial committees on a non-racial basis. The irresponsible demagogue with his cry of "one man—one vote," is deliberately blind to the chaos and suffering already experienced in the world by the premature introduction of universal adult franchise, because he sees for himself the prize of political power in exactly the same way as did Stalin, Khrushchev, and Jomo Kenyatta, one of their most eager pupils. Mr. Japhet is wrong, truly, as introduction of the Capricorn franchise proposals, or a variation of them, in this country would immediately give the black Africans a voting majority, but a majority based on responsibility and achievement in sensible degrees. Indeed, any selective franchise which failed to give a Black African majority in Tanganyika must be unacceptable and unreal when regard is given to the population numbers.

If the sources of the money income from which finances for education subsidies are derived are examined, it will be seen that contributions to the black Africans by the immigrant races are enormous. This is one of the fine acts of good faith which is sneered at by the fanatical black nationalist, and a proof that the sincere wish of the immigrant people is to help with the education of the African. Why does Mr. Japhet say that the African child gets less than one per cent as much

money as the European, when the European gets a grant of £100 a year towards the cost of overseas education, while the Government pays £750 a year for each African at an overseas educational institution? The total sum expended on African education is about one and three-fourths million pounds, and of this the contribution from Native Treasuries is about ten thousand pounds, the bulk of the remainder coming from taxes paid by the immigrant races, mainly income tax.

The Capricorn Society rejects as a principle racial representation; the present constitution introduced by Government, based on parity, is accepted as a step in the right direction toward the eventual representation on non-racial grounds. We are working for the day when a vote is cast not according to colour but on policy and principle.

Talking of the colour bar, Mr. Japhet says that there is no "legally hallowed and entrenched colour bar" and is glad, yet the belief behind TANU's apparent aims is that a good Tanganyikan must be black Tanganyikan. The fortunate position of the black American with his rights under the constitution of U.S.A., and particularly in the Southern States, may be contrasted with the anxieties which the minorities in Tanganyika will feel for the future Japhet's form of colour bar is put into practice.

Our TANU friends are most adamant that TANU has no policy and will not attempt to form one until their membership has reached one million. We are suspicious, therefore, when people talk of TANU's "proposals," because it seems to us that such people are only using TANU, with whom our only quarrel is about their racial discrimination, as a cover for their own personal opinions and ambitions. Mr. Japhet's figure for membership of TANU exceeds all bounds of reality or probability and multiplies by about six times the number given to one of our friends personally by the President of TANU himself, Mr. J. K. Nyerere, a month or so ago, as representing paid-up members.

It may not be generally known by Americans that land alienation in Tanganyika is about three per cent, and that three fifths of the total area of 356,000 square miles is at present infested by Tsetse fly and not available for development by anyone. Opening up of new land for immigrant settlers is now rare, while development schemes, machinery and capital loans await the African farmer to expand as fast as his opportunity allows. When research and hard work have freed areas of the Tsetse fly, a new era of land development and ownership will open for us all.

We believe honestly and sincerely that it is the wish of the American people to help us in the African territories to work out peaceable solutions to our problems, enabling us to take our rightful place amongst the self-governing democracies of the free world, but we are not helped by such appeals as that of Mr. Japhet, which may look sensible, human, and attractive, but in reality would lead to a racial clash in such a Territory as Tanganyika. This is why we have written to you and this is the basis of our request to you to print our letter and help us to combat some of the false arguments and misleading propositions such as those put up in Mr. Japhet's letter.

B. SEMPEHO and FREDERICK E. OMIDO
Arusha, Tanganyika

REVIEW

THE "UNCONVENTIONAL" PICTURES

IT is not surprising, nor need it be depressing, to note that vital discussions on "art" revolve around the content and intent of unusual motion pictures. In Edith Hamilton's Athens, nearly everyone was able to discuss the plays of Aristophanes, but Athens was a small city-state and its people were determined to be intellectually literate. The motion picture, even more than the novel, is the "common" art form of our time, and the fact that thousands of Hollywood productions are utterly without imagination does not preclude lively discussion when something imaginative or searching finally does appear. For example, there has been a rather astonishing amount of talk about Elia Kazan's *Baby Doll* and Jose Ferrer's *The Great Man*. Both art and challenge without pretense seem to have been accomplished by *Baby Doll*, despite its lurid advertising.

Shortly after seeing both *Baby Doll* and *The Ten Commandments*, the Rev. Donald Harrington, pastor of New York's Community Church, offered surprising comments on these films in his morning service. As reported by the *New York Times*, Rev. Harrington affirmed that the Tennessee Williams' "shocker" is an intensely moving and moral production, whereas he called DeMille's *Commandments* "fictitious and spurious," saying that it should have been titled "The Loves of Moses," since it has nothing to do with either living Christianity or any sort of morality. Following is a comment by Dr. Harrington, replying to a denunciation of *Baby Doll* by Cardinal Spellman:

Williams is out to teach us of the beauty that outbattles life's worst ugliness, of the love that outsmarts lust. I have a notion that he set a rather neat trap for the formalists who try the morality or immorality of a situation by the outer circumstances rather than by inner reality, by the letter of the law rather than by the spirit. He caught in this trap, among others, a Cardinal and a number of bishops, which curiously made this little drama a sellout.

Of the picture, *The Ten Commandments*, Dr. Harrington said: "It is four solid hours of Hollywood spectacular, but it devotes only five or ten minutes to the Ten Commandments."

Ethical evaluation, Dr. Harrington proposed, involves the perception that "what seems moral may be immoral and what seems immoral may be moral." "Baby Doll's" lover, instead of running true to type as the unscrupulous home-breaker, emerges as a man who "showed understanding and affection for her, something she had never received before." (It might be remarked that a distinctly unusual performance, so far as acting and directing are concerned, may deserve even more credit than the author, Tennessee Williams, for the excellence of this picture.)

While hundreds of thousands of movie-goers saw in the Kazan production only what the billboards told them to look for, others have discovered something more "real," something more compassionately human, about this film than anything they had seen in a long time. As Arthur Schlesinger remarked in his *New Republic* review of *Baby Doll* and *The Great Man*, "these are worth a considerable amount of discussion in intellectual circles." For *The Great Man*, also, while far less complete as a work of art and by comparison more superficial, successfully tears down a number of conventional facades. The prevailing mood is one of "ambiguous cynicism," but the manner in which truth and justice finally triumph is impressive. And that Schlesinger, an eminent historian, is interested in these pictures is a fact worthy of independent notice. He writes:

The harshness of the film is more than cinematic; it is moral. None of the pieties of the day gets a passing obeisance. Like *Baby Doll*, *The Great Man* rejects moralism, both liberal and conservative, while it affirms a more searching morality.

One observes a certain skittishness in intellectual circles about *Baby Doll*, even in the columns of *The New Republic*, as if enjoyment of that brilliant peasant comedy were indecent—not in these circles because of the sex, of course but because the people involved are squalid or subnormal and are thus

somehow exploited. Probably it is equally wrong to laugh at people who, when they try to be honest, find that the broadcasting networks can, if forced to the wall, turn honesty to their own purposes. But both *Baby Doll* and *The Great Man* offer a more complex slant on life than Hollywood has recently provided us. Both express the moods of directors—Kazan and Ferrer—with individual vision and artistic vitality. Both introduce a precious unpredictability into movie-going. Both deny the glib pulpit moralism of the fifties as well as the glib patriotic moralism of the forties and the glib social moralism of the thirties. It is too much, I am sure, to suppose that they represent a trend. But they clearly do represent a straining at the leash. Almost anything idiosyncratic is a pleasure nowadays. *The Great Man*, like *Baby Doll*, deserves a vote of gratitude.

Bosley Crowther, with his penchant for discovering new "trends," also calls *The Great Man* a truly "provocative" film. In his New York *Times* column of Jan. 13 he expressed a hope that Ferrer will make more pictures of this sort. Crowther also called attention to a French film, *We Are All Murderers*, praising its dramatic attack upon the psychology of capital punishment. Though no MANAS reviewer has seen this production, Crowther's remarks seem worth passing on. What Harrington, Schlesinger and Crowther are all saying is that the films we need—and may get in increasing number—are ones which puzzle and confuse us, making us argue about "values." Of *We Are All Murderers*, Crowther says:

We Are All Murderers is more complex and much more abstruse in its theme, but it makes up in unrelenting candor what it may lack in simple clarity. Indeed, it is so impassioned and swiftly voracious in its sweep of accusations against society that it may leave some viewers confused. If you follow it closely, however, and think upon all it implies, you may find it one of the sanest films you've ever seen.

What its director, André Cayatte, and his collaborator on the script, Charles Spaak, are principally indicting is the practice of capital punishment—the meting out of justice through the death penalty. In grimly exposing in withering detail the waiting torments of condemned men in a French jail and the various agonies of these unfortunates when they are dragged away to be guillotined, M.

Cayatte gives a blood-chilling notion of the horror of putting men to death.

But more than this, by exploring the backgrounds and the possibilities of misjudgment of these men, he develops a terrifying notion of the social ironies and inequities that are tolerated and even encouraged by people in a civilized state. And by showing his principal victim as a hoodlum who was paid and praised for killing in behalf of the French "underground," he introduces a suggestion of hypocrisy in the matter of war.

So, while movies may not be bigger and better than ever, so far as the standard production is concerned, there seems to be some hope that unusual pictures will claim their due of attention. If this comes to pass it will not be due simply to what Schlesinger calls "Hollywood's despairing war against television." Even *The Great Man* has its moments of integrity; *We Are All Murderers* is based upon the burning conviction necessary to a work of art; and *Baby Doll*, although without a "social significance" theme, ought to be one of the most talked-about pictures of the year.

COMMENTARY
SCHWEITZER IS HEARD—LOCALLY

IN MANAS for June 5 it was said that Dr. Schweitzer's appeal to the great powers to abandon nuclear weapon testing was ignored by both press and radio networks in the United States. The *Saturday Review*, however, in its May 18 issue, printed the full text of Dr. Schweitzer's address. Meanwhile, two radio stations that we know of also broadcasted the address—KPFA, the listener-sponsored station located in Berkeley, Calif., and KABC in Los Angeles. The KABC program was a local broadcast by William Winter, commentator and news analyst. Reprints of the Schweitzer address are available from Mr. Winter and from the Pasadena office of the American Friends Service Committee (825 East Union).

Milton Mayer's account (in the *Progressive* for June) of an evening spent watching *Friendly Persuasion*, a dubious celebration of the "Quaker spirit" done in full technicolor, starring Gary Cooper and Dorothy McGuire, really ought to have found a place in this week's *Review*, not because this film "belongs" with the pictures there named, but because it is so different.

Mayer devotes nearly three full pages to taking this picture apart, and if you are among those who thought it quaint, or who allowed the sterling qualities of the leading players to beguile you into enjoying it, then the Mayer dissection is a "must." This film, Mayer makes painfully clear, sells out the Quakers in nearly every scene.

You probably saw the picture. Most people did, if they go to the movies at all, for it is one of those "nice," family pictures you can take the children and the old folks to. There isn't space to repeat the story, anyhow, so Mayer's comment (or a small part of it) will have to stand alone:

Friendly Persuasion is not a misrepresentation of a Quaker family or of any family. The experience is common, in and out of Quakerism, of the parents' inability to get their children to take hold of parental

ideas—or to hold on to them themselves; so common, indeed, as to indicate the real misrepresentation of *Friendly Persuasion*. What is really, and criminally, misrepresented is the human condition, which is tragic. The reason that Hollywood movies are terrible and Italian movies are great is that Hollywood has a solution: The ending is happy, and on the road to the ending principles are scuttled in every reel without penalty or pain (oh, a few tears), every obstacle scuttles itself, and the heroes emerge miraculously reprincipled and rich.

The moral of *Friendly Persuasion* is irresistible: The Quakers are a little bit queer, but it doesn't mean a thing. They're just like the rest of us, "only human," and we can count on them to admit they're only human, and behave like brutes, when the time comes to do it. They hold out a little kind of slow to enlist. But, brother, let those intercontinental missiles start dropping, or a burglar break into the house, and watch them fight. And what fighters they are! Big, strong, tough, unbeatable fighters with their hands and their guns . . . In one word, what the Quakers no longer are is preserved in *Friendly Persuasion*, while what they are they are shown to have abandoned.

You don't like a picture like *Baby Doll*? But did you like *Friendly Persuasion*?

CHILDREN ... and Ourselves

THE DIRECTION OF HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

UNDER this title, The Cooperative League of the U.S.A. has provided a thirty-one page reprint of the last chapter of Dr. Ashley Montagu's book of the same name. This attractive, 35-cent pamphlet could also fittingly be headed "Children and Ourselves," for Dr. Montagu seems happily unable to write about either social or psychological problems in the adult world without relating them directly to the nature, capacities and problems of children.

Dr. Montagu's basic affirmation concerning the nature of man runs counter to most common assumptions in psychological circles, and also constitutes a flat denial of the theological assessment of man in terms of "original sinfulness." Any theory of education must begin with a theory of man. As Joseph Wood Kruk has put it: "In the long run the fate of a civilization depends not only on its political system, its economic structure, or its military might. Perhaps, indeed, all of these ultimately depend in turn upon the faith of the people, upon what we believe and feel about Man; about the possibilities of human nature; about our relation or lack of it to such intangibles as the meaning of morality or the true nature of Value." Dr. Montagu, in turn, writes:

The age-old view that the human being is born "a natural barbarian," "an animal," "not naturally 'good' according to any standards set by civilized society"; that children are *naturally* hostile," "little anarchists," "aggressive," "braggadocious and cruel," arises from the misinterpretations of the doctrine of "the Fall" or of "original sin." The reinforcement which these views received from nineteenth-century evolutionary biology and psychoanalytic theory in the first half of the twentieth century almost succeeded in hardening this view of the nature of human nature into something resembling an incontrovertible fact, a Law of Nature. Happily, in recent years, as a consequence of studies influenced both by

developments in evolutionary biology and psychoanalytic theory, evidence has become available which indicates that the traditional view of human nature is unsound and, what is worse, capable of being profoundly damaging to human beings and to their societies. For this evidence indicates that human beings are born good—"good" in the sense that there is no evil or hostility in them, but that at birth they are wholly prepared, equipped, to function as creatures who not only want and need to be loved by others but who also want and need to love others. The evidence for these statements has been cited at some length in these pages. Let those who know of any evidence which controverts these statements bring it forth. I do not believe that such evidence exists.

Dr. Montagu makes excellent use of quotable material from Pestalozzi and Julian Huxley; the former once wrote that "the good instincts of mankind, in their pure state, are more than gifts of art or chance. Their fundamental qualities lie deeply buried in man's nature. All men feel the need to develop these powers and the paths along which Nature reveals them must be kept clear and easy of access." And Montagu finds an important echo of this idea in the work of Sigmund Freud, despite his revelations concerning the dark labyrinths of the subconscious. Freud defined health as "the ability to love and the ability to work," and so Montagu turns to "love" as both the means and the end in the educational process. But the sort of love which is educative has little to do with the Love of God—for to desire that "His" will be done, to project all conceptions of goodness and spiritual values in the direction of a being who is not man, depletes rather than fills the reservoir of human compassion. In Montagu's terms, "God is not Love but, rather, Love is God." And, as he reminds us, "Jesus not only sent men to God, but he also sent God to men, by sending men to men. He enjoined men to live a way of life with their fellow men which was the way of love—love for each other." He continues:

Love implies the possession of a feeling of deep involvement in another, and to love another means to communicate that feeling of involvement to them. Essentially this means that while love begins as a subjective state, it must be activated and made

objective, that is, it must be demonstrative if it is to be fully realized. Love is not passive, it is active, it means involvement.

Love is unconditional, it makes no bargains and trades with no one for anything. It is given freely and without any strings attached. It says, in effect, to the loved one: "I am for you because you are you—and not because you are going to be something I want or expect you to be, but simply because you are you as you now are."

Love is firm. Love is characterized by a firmness and integrity which not only conveys a feeling of security to the loved one, but serves also as a discipline in that it helps the loved one to respond in kind. But love continues even though we know that the loved one may never respond in kind. The firmness of love conveys to the loved one that both one's "Yea" and "Nay" are equally the firm evidence of one's love. The loved one, therefore, comes to incorporate this kind of firmness within himself.

Love continually elicits, by encouragement, the nascent capacities of the loved one. In the absence of love those capacities will either fail altogether to be elicited or fail of healthy development. For example, the capacity to feel sensitively, to feel warmly toward others, the capacity to perceive rapidly the changing character of a situation, the capacity to identify with others, the ability to adjust rapidly to rapidly changing conditions, and the like. In all these capacities the person who has been loved is more efficient than the person who has been inadequately loved.

Love is joyful, it is pleasure-giving, happiness-producing, it is goodness itself. This does not mean that love is necessarily associated with states of ecstasy or gaiety. Love may produce temporary states of nonpleasure or displeasure, as for example, in children and others who are forbidden some immediate satisfaction for their own "good." Prohibitions stemming from love contribute to the development of the capacity for love and mature character.

This is so good that many readers may wish to send for the Cooperative League reprint. Montagu has done with the much abused word "love" as thorough a job of reconstruction as Erich Fromm has accomplished with "soul"—and, taken together, these two ideas help to arouse a high faith in oneself, and a high regard for every other human. But can the schools teach about

"love?" Put this way, of course, the question sounds obnoxious rather than provocative, but we must remember the clarity and perceptiveness of Montagu's definitions. In these terms, college professors are far less important than the teachers in nursery and elementary school. On this point, Montagu writes:

Our society needs to undergo a fundamental change in its attitudes toward schoolteachers, to revalue them for what they are worth—as next to the parents the most important members of the community, for teachers are the unacknowledged legislators of the world, the midwives of humanity. We need, therefore, to elevate the status and increase the prestige of the profession of teaching the young, and to reward its votaries in such a manner as to encourage the finest persons among us to dedicate their lives to the high and significant task of helping human beings realize their potentialities.

The first problem for man, as Montagu puts it, is not that of physical survival. *Psychological survival*—in war as well as in peace is the issue. And there is something beyond even psychological survival and peace of mind—namely, the discovery of those elements which make psychological survival and peace of mind possible. When these are discovered, they may be projected in such a manner as to enlarge the capacities of the child and adult alike.

Copies of *The Direction of Human Development* may be obtained from The Cooperative League of the U.S.A., 343 South Dearborn Street, Chicago 4, Illinois.

FRONTIERS

Non-Violent Defense for Britain?

ON April 24, the day after Dr. Schweitzer's appeal for an end to H-bomb testing was broadcast to fifty European countries—and was practically ignored in the United States—a British political commentator, Sir Stephen King-Hall, a Commander (ret.) in the Royal Navy, proposed that a Royal Commission be appointed to explore the potentialities of a fully pacifist program of defense for the United Kingdom.

Neither King-Hall nor the "scores" of MP's who are said to admire the logic of the journalist's proposal can be called "pacifists." The idea of non-violent defense of the British Isles is presented as a hard-headed, practical alternative to military defense.

As in the case of Dr. Schweitzer's address, Sir Stephen King-Hall's closely argued appeal has been ignored in the United States by both press and broadcasting systems.

King-Hall's article, "Reflections on Defense," first appeared in the *King-Hall News-Letter*, of which he is editor. It was reprinted in full in the London *Peace News* for May 10 (copies at 15 shillings per hundred from Peace News, 3 Blackstock Road, London, N.4).

King-Hall takes off from the British Government's recent White Paper on Defense, which reports that the United Kingdom cannot afford all-out military defense. King-Hall comments:

But the question on which the White Paper is silent is whether physical means are the only or even the best methods of defense. It is impossible to exaggerate the importance of this question and it seems wholly wrong to assume without any investigation that what may broadly be called military power is the *only* way in which defense can be made effective.

The commentator's analysis covers every phase of the question and should be read in its entirety. Here, we can only outline major points. The White Paper insists, for example, that nuclear arms for Britain would be for "defense" only. Britain, in other words, would use them only if attacked by an aggressor using nuclear weapons. But Britain is a

small country. What assurance is there that, having been attacked, Britain would be able to counterattack? King-Hall writes:

So far as the UK is concerned it has been authoritatively said that ten H-bombs of the Megaton size would reduce the country to chaotic ruin with millions of casualties. I find it hard to believe that a similar effect could be produced in the huge areas of the Soviet Union. We assume that the principal cities and industrial areas of the Soviet Union including the oil fields could be smashed, but this would not obliterate the Russian State. A peasant economy would continue to survive.

But if a well-protected British Government ("70 feet underground") and a bomber force survived the Russian H-bombs and could launch a counter-attack, what then?

It has never been very clear to me [writes King-Hall] what benefit the millions of dead and dying in Britain would derive from this operation. When the nuclear attack was limited to the relatively small atomic bombs the conception of the broken-backed war made sense. But the H-bomb has blown the foundations out of that theory. One cannot have a broken-backed war if, instead of the joints being dislocated, the vertebrae are disintegrated.

After pointing out that modern war is incredibly costly and brings nothing but grief to the victor, and noting the several successes of non-violent resistance during this century (Germany's passive resistance to the French in the Ruhr Valley in the 1920's, India's resistance to Britain, led by Gandhi, and the Israeli victory over British mandatory administration), King-Hall summarizes:

- (1) We aim to defend an *idea* [a way of life].
- (2) There are some grounds for believing that an *idea* can prevail even when the opponents of the idea are physically superior and able to occupy the territory of those defending the *idea*.
- (3) In the modern world a military victory cannot produce an economic dividend. Still less can there be any profit in a military victory obtained by nuclear weapons.

Concerning the economic aftermath of war, King-Hall says:

. . . the plain fact emerging from two world wars is that after a short period of material suffering the

vanquished emerge in a stronger economic position than that of the victors. The victors find themselves in the absurd position for reasons which appear to be directly in their own interests of having to finance the recovery of the vanquished and the more complete the physical losses of the enemy the more up-to-date is the new economy which rises from the ashes of defeat.

An interesting and recent example on a small scale of this phenomenon is to be seen in the experiences of the Kikuyu tribe in Kenya. The other tribes are saying with a deal of reason: "Look at the money and effort which are being expended on social services, rehabilitation, etc., for the Kikuyu. Is it necessary to stage a Mau Mau rebellion in order to receive all these good things?"

An honest answer would be: "Not necessarily, but it might be helpful!"

King-Hall's concluding argument moves from the point that there is no real defense against nuclear weapons, while retaliation only enlarges the area of destruction. Thus the old principle that "to every form of attack there must exist a means of defense" seems to break down. He continues:

We have now reached a stage in the development of the attack which enables total destruction to be achieved and as it is physically impossible to put the whole of a modern social system 100 feet underground and turn the United Kingdom into a nation of troglodytes, it might seem at first glance that the principle has broken down.

But it seems to have been forgotten that the principle does not say that the answer to an attack must be of *the same order of things as the attack*.

For a fresh answer to attack, King-Hall develops the idea of an all-out educational campaign on the horror and futility of nuclear war, to be carried to the populations of nations which are potential aggressors. The campaign would begin with proclamation of an immediate end to nuclear weapons testing.

He asks for consideration of the fact that the men in the Kremlin are human beings who are able to change their minds; who have several times changed their minds since 1945; and whom the West has been attempting to influence by the threat of nuclear weapons as "deterrents." So it is not a

matter of it being "impossible" to change the minds of the men in the Kremlin, but of the best way to attempt it.

King-Hall concludes:

What about a fully pacifist policy?

The truth is that this possibility has never been thoroughly examined from a strictly political-strategical angle. The "pacifist" policy has usually been defended from a moral point of view.

I am thinking of a policy which it would be more accurate to call "defense by passive resistance."

I am not saying it would work. I am saying that no one has thoroughly studied its possibilities in the light of the novel and unprecedented defense problem which now faces the UK, Western Europe and to a lesser extent the USA. . . .

Has it or can it be proved that a United Kingdom with an intelligent and sophisticated population educated to regard a national plan of passive resistance as the defense policy of the country would lose influence? I think there is a case for a very thorough investigation of this matter.

Commenting on King-Hall's proposal, Frank Allaun, MP, called it "the most important, most brilliant, thing I've read in a long time." A number of MP's, he said, would be ready to back the proposal for a Royal Commission to study the potentialities of a pacifist policy for Britain.

Prof. Barbara Wootton, a leading British thinker, said that King-Hall has forced attention to the idea of pacifist resistance to aggression. She added:

Realistically, I do not think that any Government is likely to take these proposals seriously in the immediate future. But the whole history of reform supports the view that what is ridiculous in one generation is practical political controversy in the next, and may be realized in the third.

Now that the first step has been taken, the second and third become immensely more likely.